```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
                   FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA
2.
JOHN GILBERT,
        Plaintiff,
4
  vs.
5
APC NATCHIQ, INC.
        Defendants.
                                    Case No. 3:03-CV-00174-RRB
8
               DEPOSITION OF CHRISTOPHER B. BOYLE
9
                          June 1, 2006
10
APPEARANCES:
11
                                    MR. KENNETH L. COVELL
        FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
12
                                    Attorney at Law
                                    712 Eighth Avenue
13
                                    Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
                                    (907) 452-4377
14
        FOR THE DEFENDANT:
                                    MS. PATRICIA L. ZOBEL
15
                                    DeLisio Moran Geraghty &
                                    Zobel
16
                                    Attorneys at Law
                                    943 West Sixth Avenue
17
                                    Anchorage, Alaska 99501
                                    (907) 279-9574
18
        ALSO PRESENT:
                                    MR. JOHN GILBERT
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

2

1

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Pursuant to Notice, the Deposition of CHRISTOPHER B.

BOYLE was taken on behalf of the Plaintiff before Cheri Tabor,

Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, and electronic

reporter for Metro Court Reporting at the offices of DeLisio

Moran Geraghty & Zobel, 943 West Sixth Avenue, Anchorage,

Alaska, on the 1st day of June, 2006, commencing at the hour

of 9:00 o'clock a.m.

\* \* \* \*

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Direct Examination by Mr. Covell ...... 4

#### METRO COURT REPORTING

1	EXHIBI'	TS PAG	<u>}E</u>
2	B-1 -	Memo, 12/26/96, Boyle to Dieckmeyer et al	. 15
3		Position description, Safety Supervisor	. 32
4	B-4 -	Memo, 4/4/97, Boyle to Nelson & Schick Letter, 6/19/97, Nelson to Carr	. 59
5		Letter, 6/25/97, Nelson to Carr	
6		* * * *	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

## 1 PROCEEDINGS

- 2 (On record)
- GOURT REPORTER: We're on record. My name is Gheri Tabor and I'm a court reporter with Metro Court Beporting in Anchorage, Alaska. Today's date is June 1, 2006, and the time is approximately 9:00 a.m. We are at the offices of DeLisio Moran Geraghty & Zobel, P.C., 943 West Sixth Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska 99501 for the deposition of Chris Boyle. This case is in the United States District Court for the District of Alaska in the matter of Gilbert vs. APC, Case Number 3:03-CV-00174 (RBR).
- Sir, would you please raise your right hand so I could swear you in.
- (Oath administered)
- MR. BOYLE: I do.

#### 16 CHRISTOPHER B. BOYLE

having first been duly sworn under oath, testified as follows:

- 18 COURT REPORTER: Thank you. Please state your full name and spell your last name for the record.
- An Christopher B. Boyle. B-O-Y-L-E.
- 21 COURT REPORTER: All right. And I need a mailing address.
- A3 3900 C Street, Anchorage 99503.
- 24 COURT REPORTER: Okay.
- A5 Suite 700.

COURT REPORTER: Okay. Thank you. And how

#### METRO COURT REPORTING

about a daytime or a message telephone number.

- A 339-6924.
- COURT REPORTER: All right. Counsel, would you please identify yourselves and who you represent, and if you have a guest, please introduce your guest.
- 6 MR. COVELL: Kenneth Covell for plaintiff John Gilbert.
- MS. ZOBEL: And I'm Patricia Zobel. I'm here gn behalf of APC Natchiq, Inc. And I believe Mr. Gilbert is in the room.
- 11 COURT REPORTER: All right. You may proceed.
- MR. COVELL: Thank you.
- 13 **DIRECT EXAMINATION**

#### BY MR. COVELL:

- Q5 Mr. Boyle, you're the human resources director APC or
- its progeny, is that correct?
- A7 Yes.
- Q8 Okay. And you've been in that position since about
- 19 1994, is that right?
- Ao No.
- $Q_1$  Okay. '90 -- when have you been in that position
- 22 since?
- A3 With that title, probably late 90s.
- Q4 Okay.
- $\Delta_5$  Or 2000. Not -- I don't recall exactly.
- Q And prior to -- you're the head of the department,

#### METRO COURT REPORTING

- whatever the title might be, right?
- No, I'm not.
- Q Okay.
- A No, I'm not.
- $\mathbb{Q}$  All right. Okay. What -- are you the head of
- 6 something?
- 7 MS. ZOBEL: His household maybe.
- No, I have a direct supervisor, senior vice president
- of human resources. I report to him. I am the
- 10 director of human resources. In that capacity I deal
- with policies, procedures, et cetera.
- Q2 Okay. And the individual that's above you, the vice
- president, they have other duties besides dealing with
- human resources, is that correct?
- A5 Correct.
- $Q_6$  Okay.
- And that's senior vice president not vice -- vice
- 18 president.
- Qo So is it fair to say you're the nuts and bolts, day-
- to-day man that runs the human resources department?
- A1 No.
- **Q**2 Okay.
- As In certain aspects of the human resources, yes.
- Q4 Okay.
- As But to say the whole department, no.
- Q Okay. All right. And in regard -- well, all right.

- 1 That's fine. Okay. And as far as people within APC,
- is -- or you're ASRC Energy Services now? What should
- 3 we be calling.....
- A I work for ASRC Energy Services.
- Q Okay.
- And there's many subsidiaries beneath that parent
- 7 organization.
- Okay. When Mr. Gilbert worked for the organization or
- g a permutation of it, it was known as APC, is that
- 10 right? Or not?
- $\mathtt{A}_1$  I don't know whether it was straight APC or at that
- 12 time maybe APC Natchiq.
- Q3 Okay. All right.
- A4 I'm not sure which one.
- Q5 Okay. And when the organization you're with went
- through its name change, permutations, and
- reorganizations, did your area of responsibility
- expand greatly? In other words, did you have sort of
- a division with 300 people and then get to be the
- director of sort of a broad spectrum of companies or
- divisions with thousands of people?
- $\underline{\lambda}_{2}$  No. It was pretty much the same.
- Q3 Okay. All right. Approximately how many people come
- 24 under the auspices of your department?
- As Gosh, I can't answer that. I don't know.
- Q Okay. Is it tens, hundreds, thousands?

- A Within the organization at that time just APC I
- believe had close to 1500 to 2000 employees.
- Q Okay.
- But I can't -- again, that -- they weren't directly
- 5 under my auspices as you referenced.
- Well, what -- well, one of the issues that you in your
- official capacity would deal with is whether or not
- 8 somebody is classified as exempt or non-exempt for
- 9 overtime, right? Or wrong?
- An I could get involved in reviews.
- Q1 All right. So at the time Mr. Gilbert worked there,
- roughly '01 to '03, how many people could you have an
- effect on their position as to whether it's exempt or
- 14 non-exempt?
- As Gosh, I -- I don't know.
- Q6 Okay. Would that be.....
- A7 You would be asking me to speculate.
- Q8 Would that be in that range of 1500 people?
- A9 I -- I'm just citing the population of that
- 20 organization.
- Q<sub>1</sub> Okay. Good. That's.....
- Ag Yeah.
- Q3 I'm just trying to get.....
- Approximately.
- Q5 Okay. I'm....
- A Yeah.

- Q .....just trying to get a drift here. Is that number
- 2 significantly different today?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. And approximately what the -- what might that
- 5 number be today?
- A With -- the organization is now titled ASRC Energy
- 7 Services Operations and Maintenance.
- Q Right.
- And they have close to 2,000 employees.
- $Q_0$  Okay. All right.
- $A_1$  Just that organization.
- Q2 Okay. Now, do you have -- that's -- what I'm trying
- to find out is did you -- your field of authority, if
- that's the right way to put it, or the people you
- provided human resources to has expanded greatly or
- 16 not?
- A7 Based on -- if you just work it based on the increased
- number of employees within the organization, just
- 19 based on that, yes.
- **Q**0 Okay.
- An You know, just based on the increased number.
- $Q_2$  All right. But it didn't go from say 1500 people to
- 23 10,000 people?
- A4 No.
- Q5 But from maybe 1500 to 2500, something like -something....

A	Sure.
₩.	Burc.

- Q .....along those lines? Okay. Good. All right.
- MS. ZOBEL: Just to clarify the record, I

think he said 2,000, not 2500.

- 5 MR. COVELL: That's fine.
- Yeah.
- 7 MS. ZOBEL: Okay.
- Q (By Mr. Covell) Okay. What did you do to prepare for
- 9 today's deposition, if anything?
- An I read -- I read my previous deposition.
- Q1 Okay. Is there anything about that deposition that
- you read that you disagree with, that you think was
- incorrect when you said it, or was misquoted or
- 14 anything to that effect?
- As On the brief review I did, no.
- Q6 Okay. All right. You were involved with the Zuber
- 17 case, right?
- As Yes, I was deposed in that case.
- Qo Okay. And you were involved in assisting the company
- in getting the papers together and working on the
- case, right?
- $\frac{1}{2}$  In that case, yes.
- Q3 Okay. And that's also true in this case?
- A4 I've had very minimal involvement in this case.
- Q5 Okay. Who at the company -- it's been suggested to me that you, Mark Nelson and Doug Smith are the people at

#### METRO COURT REPORTING

1	the company who would have the most knowledge
2	concerning the matters involved in this case. Would
3	you agree with that, disagree with that, think there's
4	some well, would you agree with that or disagree
5	with that?
8	It all depends on what the questions are.
<b>Q</b>	Okay. Well, as to questions regarding what Mr.
8	Gilbert did well, let's put that aside. Questions
9	regarding whether or not his position as safety
10	supervisor is exempt?
<b>卦</b> 1	I would have very little knowledge of what his day-to-
12	day activities are.
<b>2</b> 3	Okay. But would you have knowledge as to the
14	applicable rules and regulations and now determine
15	whether or not that was an exempt or non-exempt
16	position?
<b>全</b> 7	I can just site, you know, the the regulations
18	under wage and hour, and but applying that to what his
19	day-to-day activities are, I don't know how those
20	connect.
<b>Q</b> 1	Okay. Is there anybody in the company that does know
22	how those connect?
<b>∄</b> 3	His direct supervisor at the time I'm sure.
<b>Q</b> 4	And that would be Doug Smith?

Okay. All right. When Mis -- you have expertise in

I believe that's correct.

**⊉**5

Q

- the field of human relations, right?
- A Human resources.
- Human resources, I'm sorry. Excuse me. All right.
- 4 Human resources. And that would -- was that a yes?
- Ay Yes, I do.
- Q Okay. All right.
- Ay Yes, sir.
- Q Okay.
- A Yes.
- $Q_0$  All right. And I take it by your title that you would
- be the person in the company with the most or the best
- 12 knowledge in that area, is that fair to say?
- A₃ In what area?
- Q4 The area of determining whether a position ought to be
- exempt or non-exempt, putting aside what somebody
- actually does, because you don't have that
- 17 information?
- Ag I would disagree with that.
- Q9 Okay. Who might that be?
- And there is no one person, unless -- unless we farm it
- out to outside counsel. As I'd -- it's a
- collaborative effort between human resources and the
- on-site personnel.
- Q4 Okay. All right. And in the case of Mr. -- in Mr.
- Zuber's lawsuit, we had a lot of discussion about that. There was a process, if you will, and don't let

- me put words in your mouth, okay, but there's a
- 2 process whereby the field department and human
- resources would get together, figure out what a guy
- did, apply the regulations and decide whether or not
- they ought to be classified exempt of non-exempt, is
- 6 that fair to say?
- A No.
- All right. What would be fair to say?
- That may happen.
- $Q_0$  Okay.
- All But the job site may take the initiative to undertake
- that review, and it's not required to consult with
- human resources. But if there is an issue, like I
- said before, it's a collaborative effort, and then a
- determination is made.
- Q6 Okay. So at some point human resources has to get
- involved to make a determination, is that right.....
- As No.
- Q9 ....or wrong?
- And That's not what I said.
- $Q_1$  Okay. Well, I'm trying to.....
- At 2 It may get involved.
- Q3 Okay. Well, can the job site say, gee, this ought to
- be exempt or non-exempt and switch it and have no
- involvement from human resources?
- A They can.

$ \mathfrak{Q} $	Don't you have to put out a new job position
2	description or change to get the name changed or the
3	description changed at payroll so the pay is
4	different?
<b>B</b>	There's there is a process that is accomplished
6	through filing paperwork to change job titles and so
7	on. Again, getting back to the number of employees,
8	the number of transactions, I do not see every
9	transaction that passes through the company.
<b>Q</b> 0	Okay. Do you know of any instance where a job got
11	changed from exempt to non-exempt and human resources
12	had no involvement with it?
<b>⊉</b> 3	I'm try I'm sure there's cases out there, yes.
<b>Q</b> 4	Okay. Could could you
<b>⊉</b> 5	I can't cite any, but
<b>Q</b> 6	Because nobody told you, right?
<b>⊉</b> 7	Yeah.
28	Yeah, it's
<b>⊉</b> 9	Yeah.
20	Okay. All right. Okay. What expertise do the people
21	in the field departments, if that's the right way to
22	put it, have in determining whether or not an
23	individual ought to be classified exempt or non-
24	exempt?
<b>⊉</b> 5	There have agged to the appropriate wage and hour
	They have access to the appropriate wage and hour

- and long tests that were issued to guide individuals
- in making an assessment whether the position is --
- should be appropriately classified as exempt or -- or
- 4 not.
- Q Okay. And those short and long tests were distributed
- to the field divisions back in '97 or so?
- A I can't answer that for sure. I don't know.
- Q Okay. All right. Did you review any of the exhibits
- 9 from your deposition?
- $A_0$  No.
- $Q_1$  Okay.
- MR. COVELL: Why don't we start with number 1, Madame Clerk.
- MS. ZOBEL: And I believe we decided yesterday this is going to be B-1.
- MR. COVELL: That works for me.
- MS. ZOBEL: Okay. I'm glad you're here again tgday.
- 19 COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
- MR. COVELL: Yeah. We like continuity.
- MS. ZOBEL: The same court reporter. She

wasn't -- we weren't sure we'd get her back today.

- MR. COVELL: Okay. Let me put the sticker on that, Madame Clerk.
- 25 (Deposition Exhibit B-1 marked)

COURT REPORTER: All right. Exhibit B-1

#### METRO COURT REPORTING

marked.

- MR. COVELL: All right. Here you go.
- Q (By Mr. Covell) I'm handing you B-1. This purports
- to be a memo from yourself December 26th, 1996. The
- subsequent pages concern exemptions under the State
- 6 Wage and Hour Act, and, let's see here.
- 7 MS. ZOBEL: It looks like you're missing a page.
- 9 MR. COVELL: All right. And which page might 10be missing, do you know?
- MS. ZOBEL: Well, the last page ends in the middle of a sentence.
- MR. COVELL: Okay.
- MS. ZOBEL: I don't know whether it was included when he sent that or not, but....
- MR. COVELL: I think this is the way I got it.
- MS. ZOBEL: Okay. That's fine.
- MR. COVELL: And if you feel there's a reason
- to supplement it, I'm more than happy to.....
- MS. ZOBEL: Sure. I'll take a look.
- MR. COVELL: ....leave that open.
- MS. ZOBEL: I did not bring down the
- deposition or the records that pertain to Mr. -- I'm assuming you got this out of Mr. Zuber's file?
- MR. COVELL: Right. This would be from the Zuber file.

#### METRO COURT REPORTING

- 1 MS. ZOBEL: And I did not bring those records with me, so.....
- MR. COVELL: And I haven't done this, and it qidn't occur to me until after I'd copied them all, for the goint of our clarity, it would have been real helpful that anything that's from Zuber we'd put a Z before the APC, on the 7- that won't be on your stickers, Madam Clerk, but just for 8- because we have in this case APC with sequential numbers.

  As a matter of fact....
- MS. ZOBEL: And these are going to not be the same numbers as the documents which we produced to you in this case. APC 0184 is not this record in the.....
- MR. COVELL: In this case, did you.....
- MS. ZOBEL: ....in Gilbert.
- MR. COVELL: .....start like at 1,000 in

Gilbert or something?

- MS. ZOBEL: I have -- we started at 1.
- 18 MR. COVELL: Oh. Right.
- 19 MS. ZOBEL: 00001.
- MR. COVELL: So that's what I'm saying, so in
- 21 so in Gilbert there will be an APC 184, right? So.....
- MS. ZOBEL: Right. And it's not this

document.

MR. COVELL: Right. So what I'm saying is, we gight to put -- I should have put Z's in front of them all, but....

#### METRO COURT REPORTING

- MS. ZOBEL: You could ask the witness to do that, and I have.....
- MR. COVELL: Right. That's.....
- MS. ZOBEL: .....no problem with it happening.
- (By Mr. Covell) That's what I'd like you to do. If
- 6 you could put a Z before that APC on the bottom right-
- 7 hand corner of the page, please.
- MS. ZOBEL: Actually the APC number seems to be obliterated.
- MR. COVELL: Obliterated. I'm still going to put a Z there.
- MS. ZOBEL: All right.
- MR. COVELL: And on the following pages, and I4ll try to keep up with this either through myself or the witness. And if anybody wants to remind me we're not doing that, it would be good.
- MS. ZOBEL: Was that a look at me, that I'm supposed to remind you?
- MR. COVELL: I was.....
- MS. ZOBEL: I'll be happy to remind you.
- MR. COVELL: .....only suggesting that one morning, you know, you'll be going through the papers and

gging is this a Zuber or.....

- MS. ZOBEL: I know. I agree.
- MR. COVELL: Right.
- Q (By Mr. Covell) Okay. All right. So getting back

#### METRO COURT REPORTING

1	to B-1 here, Mr. Boyle, and why don't you look with me
2	in the in the body of the letter, I think there's a
3	paragraph or sentence in there saying, here's the
4	regulations for your use. See if you can identify
5	that, and I'll look for it, too.
6	(Pause)
<b>Q</b>	Okay. In that paragraph that starts with 1, the
8	second sentence, see the sentence, provided as
9	guidance is an attached document which provides
10	functional definitions of exempt employees in
11	administrative, executive, and professional positions.
<b>A</b> 2	Uh-huh. (Affirmative)
<b>Q</b> 3	Okay.
<b>⊉</b> 4	Okay.
<b>Q</b> 5	So it would appear from this exhibit that in 1996 you
16	sent out this document to various people in the field,
17	is that so?
<b>⊉</b> 8	Correct.
Ω9	Okay. All right. So they would have had that
20	resource available to them in the field?
<b>⊉</b> 1	Yes.
<b>Q</b> 2	All right. And then it's your expectation, or your
23	understanding of the way classification works at your
24	company, that the field people would make a
25	determination as to whether or not an individual was
	exempt or non-exempt, sometimes with consultation with

- 1 you and your department, and sometimes without?
- A Yes.
- Okay. All right. Okay. To your knowledge was there
- ever an investigation, review or examination of the
- 5 position of safety specialist as to whether or not it
- was exempt or non-exempt for purposes of overtime?
- A I believe Mark -- Mark Nelson had undertaken such a
- g review.
- And this is -- I'm distinguishing safety supervisor
- 10 from safety specialist.
- A1 I thought you had just said specialist?
- Q2 If I said that, that's not what I wanted to say,
- 13 so....
- A4 Could you restate.....
- Q5 Okay. You bet.
- A6 ....then, please?
- Q7 As to the classification of safety specialist, which
- was the second job Mr. Gilbert had after he got
- 19 promoted.....
- MS. ZOBEL: No, that.....
- A1 No.
- MR. GILBERT: No.
- MS. ZOBEL: .....would be safety supervisor.
- 24 MR. COVELL: Okay. I'm misstating it. I'm
- §grry. Safety -- safety supervisor. Thank you for correcting
  me.

(By Mr. Covell) The second job that he had, safety Q supervisor, was there ever an investigation, 2. examination, whatever you want to call it, as to 3 whether or not that job ought to be classified exempt 4 or non-exempt? 5 Not to my knowledge. Q Okay. All right. Is that something that you likely would have been aware of? 8 Not necessarily. **A** Okay. Not even since the Zuber case?  $\mathfrak{Q}_0$ Zuber case involved the classification of safety 11 specialist, right? 12 Yes. **A**3 And you were involved in that matter? **Q**4 Yes. **A**5 And if that precipitated somehow or ever was just **Q**6 temporally related to a review of safety supervisor, 17 wouldn't you think that was something that you would 18 be -- either be involved in or at least hear about? 19 Well, no, I disagree with that. **⊉**0 Okay. **Q**1 **A**2 Because I think the cases were so close together in -in the time frame that it doesn't apply. 23 Okay. So if such a thing were to happen and you might **Q**4

#### METRO COURT REPORTING

or might not be involved as human resources, but

apparently you weren't, because either it didn't

25

happen or you didn't hear about it, would the other 1 person or persons who would know about it be Doug 2. Smith? 3 I can't answer that. I can't speculate on what he may A have done or not. 5 Not -- don't speculate, but assume that some nature of review was done in that regard, okay? Let's say 7 somebody comes in your office, says, Mr. Boyle, 8 there's been a review done somewhere here in the 9 company, do you know about it? No, sir, I don't. 10 Well, who should we call to try to find out, or who do 11 you think might have involved in doing this? 12 MS. ZOBEL: Objection, calls for speculation. 13 1 You can go ahead and answer if you know. Logically I would either direct the person to the **A**5 business unit manager, or the safety director of the 16 corporation. 17 (By Mr. Covell) Okay. And who's the safety director **Q**8 of the corporation? 19 I think at that -- that time it was Doug Smith. **⊉**0 Okay. All right. **Q**1 **A**2 There -- there had been some changes, and he was elevated to that position approximately that time. 23 Okay. All right. And even if it weren't Mr. Smith, 24 he could tell you who was before him or after him if 25

#### METRO COURT REPORTING

there's a time frame issue there?

<u>A</u>	Yes.
Q	Okay. Good. All right. And then as far as unit
3	manager goes, and I recognize that people are moving
4	around and we have different times here, but at one
5	point is it correct that Mark Nelson was the unit
6	manager for the job Mr. Gilbert would have been in?
<b>A</b>	Yes, at Kuparuk.
Q	Okay. All right. Okay. All right. Besides those
9	two individuals-slant-jobs, are there any other either
10	people or positions that would have been involved, or
11	might have been involved in such a review?
<b></b> 2	It could be the individual that occupies the position.
<b>Q</b> 3	Okay. And tell me how that might come about?
<b></b> 4	Well, from the standpoint of clearly identifying day-
15	to-day activities and responsibilities, it would be
16	logical to talk to the people that are actually
17	performing the job.
₽8	Okay. All right. And if a review was done, it would
19	then make sense to say, what do you do every day,
20	because even if somebody's job description says
21	they're doing A, because of the pressure of the work
22	place, they may indeed be involved doing B all day
23	instead, even if they don't want to be?
<u>₹</u> 4	Possibly.

**Q**5

Okay. All right. And so if people in the field were

to make the determination as to whether somebody was

exempt or non-exempt, I believe I asked you what 1 expertise they might have in that area, and that's how 2. I believe we got off on these attachments to Exhibit 3 1, besides having that resource to make that 4 determinations, what other skill, expertise or tools 5 might they have to make the determination of exempt or 6 non-exempt? 7 MS. ZOBEL: Calls for speculation. 8 MR. COVELL: Okay. Well.... 9 Yeah, I would be speculating. **₽**0 (By Mr. Covell) Right. Well.... **Q**1 You'd -- you'd have to go back and review each 42. individual's educational background, had they attended 13 special courses on this. That I don't know. 14 Okay. All right. **Q**5 MS. ZOBEL: If you want to narrow it down to 16 one individual or several individuals, he might.... MR. COVELL: Okay. 18 MS. ZOBEL: .....have knowledge of that. 19 (By Mr. Covell) All right. Well, what expertise 20 might Doug Smith have in that regard, if you know? 21 **A**2 I don't. **Q**3 Okay.

## METRO COURT REPORTING

All right. What expertise might Mark Nelson have in

I don't know.

that regard, if you know?

**A**4

**Q**5

- A I don't know.
- Q Okay. All right.
- 3 (Off record comments)
- The safety supervisor job no longer exists, right?
- A I -- I'm not certain about that.
- Q Okay.
- A I don't know.
- Q I think it's been represented to us that that job got
- 9 reclassified or organized sometime in the range of
- 10 2003. You don't know?
- A<sub>1</sub> I don't know.
- Q2 Okay. All right. When -- in any event, when the job
- existed, it was classified as exempt or do you know or
- 14 not know?
- As Yes.
- $Q_6$  Okay.
- A7 It's my understanding.
- Qg All right. Among the classifications of exemption,
- there are at least administrative, professional and
- 20 executive, and perhaps others. Which of these
- classifications of exemption was the safety supervisor
- job in?
- A3 I don't know.
- Q4 Okay.
- It could have been in any -- any one of those that you listed.

- Q Okay. All right. And you've never had opportunity to
- do the analysis of that position as to whether or not
- it's exempt or not exempt?
- A No.
- $\S$  All right. And this is a redundant question, but I'm
- asking it to be clear for the record, so forgive me,
- you've never done the analysis to figure out whether
- or not it fits into administrative, professional,
- 9 executive or other categories either?
- Q1 All right. Do you know when that job was created?
- $A_2$  I don't.
- Q3 Okay. I had been under the impression from some
- materials it had started when Mr. Gilbert took the
- job, which would have been January of '01 I believe,
- 16 but.....
- MS. ZOBEL: January of '02.
- Qg January of '02. Okay. All right. But he indicated
- to me that wasn't the case. Do you have any
- information off the top of your head in that regard.
- Al I don't.
- Q2 Okay. All right. Do you remember that job existing
- 23 say in '94 or '97?
- A4 I would have to speculate on that, because I
- 25 don't....
- Q That's fine. That's.....

- A .....I didn't belong to.....
- 0 ....let's move on.
- A .....the organization.
- Q Okay. All right.
- A In fact, I wasn't even employed in '94.
- When we did your deposition last time, we'd been
- asking for a job description of safety supervisor, and
- g it was represented to my by Mr. Youngman that it
- g didn't exist, and we discussed that during your
- deposition. First of all, do you recollect that, or
- 11 had you -- and/or.....
- MR. COVELL: I know it's compound, and you can object.
- Q4 ....and/or had you seen that in your review of your
- deposition recently?
- A6 I don't recall the discussion, but I reviewed that in
- the deposition, yes.
- $Q_8$  Okay. And do you believe that to be true, that....
- That's correct. I'm not aware of a job description
- that's available.
- Q1 Okay. All right. Yesterday in a deposition we got G-
- 22 2, which was a job description. Do you know where
- that came from and -- well, okay. And then the next
- question I'll ask you is when it was created?
- A5 I don't know to either question.
- Q Okay. Does human resources keep copies of job

- descriptions?
- Q Okay.
- And it currently is as a matter of fact.
- § So the practice still is, is to keep the job
- 6 description at the job site?
- A If they exist to begin with.
- Okay. And so you don't necessarily have one for every
- g job?
- $Q_1$  Okay. All right. And I'm probably be redundant here,
- but that's the current practice as well? You don't
- have a centralized file of job descriptions in
- 14 Anchorage?
- Not -- well, not at this point. We are developing one
- though.
- Q7 Okay.
- Ag We're working on that as a -- as a project this year.
- Q9 Okay. Who would know, or if you wanted to find out --
- well, okay. Who would know when, where, why, how that
- 21 was developed, if you know?
- A2 Would you restate the question? I'm not sure
- 23 what.....
- Q4 Okay. There's a job description for safety
- supervisor. I'll represent that to you. We saw it yesterday. Okay. Assume that to be true. And.....

- A Back in 2000, 2001, is that the time frame you're
- 2 requesting?
- $\mathfrak{g}$  Well, from the date of your deposition in 2003, I
- think, until today, it would appear that that job
- description was created or written. Do you think --
- is that fair to say?
- A I have no knowledge of that.
- Q Okay.
- A I don't know.
- $Q_0$  Well, if nobody can find one in '03, either it didn't
- exist or nobody could find it, right? Would you....
- Agree.
- Q3 .....agree with that? Okay. So between '03 and
- yesterday, either somebody found it or wrote it.
- 15 Would you agree with that?
- $\mathbb{A}_6$  Yes.
- Q7 Okay. So what I'm trying to get at is who either
- 18 found it or created it?
- Ag I don't know.
- Qo Okay. If you were looking for that, how would you go
- about trying to find out that information?
- A2 If I was looking for the job description, or the
- individual who found it or created it, because.....
- Q4 How it came to be on this earth?
- As I would have to go back to the job site, Kuparuk.
- Q Okay. And....

- And start asking questions.
- And would Doug Smith be the guy to go to on that?
- A He would probably be one of the people.
- Q Okay.
- A Yes.
- Any other names that come to mind, names.....
- A No.
- Q .....or positions.....
- A No.
- $Q_0$  .....that come to mind that would be a resource to
- 11 find that information?
- Again the business unit manager.
- $Q_3$  Okay.
- A4 Gary Buchanan.
- Φ5 Okay. All right. Do you or your department review
- job descriptions when they're created?
- Again, what time frame?
- Detween your deposition and yesterday?
- A9 I have not other than the ones that we've created
- within the department beginning the mid part of last
- 21 year.
- Q2 Okay. And that's part of your on-going project to get
- a data base as you -- if you will of job descriptions?
- A4 Yes.
- Q5 Okay. All right. And this would be a redundant question, but during the course of that, you haven't

1	done one for haven't reviewed one for safety
2	supervisor, right?
<b>3</b> 3.	There prob I'm not sure if there is one existing
4	for that position given our current project. I mean,
5	we've got about 250 job titles, and I don't recall
6	each one specifically.
<b>Q</b>	So the description we saw yesterday might have come
8	out of your building data bank of job descriptions, is
9	that right or wrong?
<b>⊉</b> 0	I can't answer that. I'd have to take a look at the
11	job description you're referring to.
Ψ2	Okay.
13	MR. COVELL: Let's go off record.
14	(Off record)
14 15	(Off record)  (Deposition Exhibit B-2 marked)
15	(Deposition Exhibit B-2 marked)
15 16	(Deposition Exhibit B-2 marked) (On record)
15 16 17	(On record)  COURT REPORTER: We're back on record at 9:37.
15 16 17 <b>2</b> 8	(On record)  (On record)  COURT REPORTER: We're back on record at 9:37.  (By Mr. Covell) What you have before you, Mr. Boyle,
15 16 17 <b>Q</b> 8 19	(On record)  (On record)  COURT REPORTER: We're back on record at 9:37.  (By Mr. Covell) What you have before you, Mr. Boyle, is marked Exhibit B-2 which was also marked G-2 in Mr.
15 16 17 Q8 19 20	(On record)  (On record)  COURT REPORTER: We're back on record at 9:37.  (By Mr. Covell) What you have before you, Mr. Boyle, is marked Exhibit B-2 which was also marked G-2 in Mr. Gilbert's deposition yesterday for the record.
15 16 17 28 19 20	(On record)  (On record)  (Ourt Reporter: We're back on record at 9:37.  (By Mr. Covell) What you have before you, Mr. Boyle, is marked Exhibit B-2 which was also marked G-2 in Mr. Gilbert's deposition yesterday for the record.  That's the job description I was talking about. In
15 16 17 Q8 19 20 Q1 22	(On record)  (On record)  COURT REPORTER: We're back on record at 9:37.  (By Mr. Covell) What you have before you, Mr. Boyle, is marked Exhibit B-2 which was also marked G-2 in Mr. Gilbert's deposition yesterday for the record.  That's the job description I was talking about. In looking at that, does that does it jog your memory as
15 16 17 \$\textstyle{2}8\$ 19 20 \$\textstyle{2}1\$ 22 23	(On record)  (On record)  (Our Reporter: We're back on record at 9:37.  (By Mr. Covell) What you have before you, Mr. Boyle, is marked Exhibit B-2 which was also marked G-2 in Mr. Gilbert's deposition yesterday for the record.  That's the job description I was talking about. In looking at that, does that does it jog your memory as to whether you've seen it before or not?

- A No.
- Q Okay. All right. Does -- and again, it's -- can you
- tell from looking at it, if that looks like something
- that might have been generated in the field?
- It looks like, yes.
- Q Okay. All right. Excellent.
- 7 MS. ZOBEL: May I see it, Chris? Thank you.
- 8 (Pause)
- Q (By Mr. Covell) When that job description -- assuming
- that job description was created in the field, would
- it have been appropriate for the person that did it to
- consider whether or not it was an exempt or non-exempt
- 13 position?
- A4 I would think so, yes.
- Q5 Okay. Is there any paperwork trail that would
- 16 accompany that consideration?
- Not that I'm aware of on this particular document
- 18 here.
- Q9 Okay.
- Ao I don't know if there's any back up to it.
- Q<sub>1</sub> Okay. Should there be?
- A2 If there was a question about whether it is exempt or
- not, there hopefully would have been some analysis
- 24 performed.
- Q5 Okay. And we may have covered this. We've covered it either this time or last time, but try and move things

1	along, I'll give you a little narrative here. Ms.
2	Zobel can object. But are the types of things that
3	would precipitate an examination of exempt or non-
4	exempt be a complaint from an employee, a question
5	from a supervisor, some correspondence from the
6	Department of Labor, things of that nature?
<b></b>	It could be any one of those.
<b>©</b>	Okay. All right. Do you know if Mr. Gilbert ever
9	made a complaint about whether or not he was getting
10	overtime?
<b>A</b> 1	Not that I'm aware of.
<b>Q</b> 2	Okay. If he did make such a complaint, what should
13	APC, and let me just use APC as a blanket name, APC or
14	Natchiq as a blanket name for whatever name the
15	company might have at the time. What should APC do
16	about that?
<b>⊉</b> 7	I would think there would be some higher level review
18	of the complaint, like we perform with any any
19	complaint on a routine basis.
20	Okay. So if he went he's a safety supervisor, and
21	he went to his boss and said, hey, I'm not getting
22	overtime, I ought to get overtime, what level would
23	that get reviewed at in that instance? Or should it
24	get reviewed at?
<b>⊉</b> 5	It all depends. It may stop with a discussion with
	the upper level supervisor, you know, that direct

- report or it may go on to the next higher level.
- 2 That's up to the individual supervisor.
- Q Okay. And in this instance, if Doug Smith was the
- 4 next level up, it might end with him, or it might go
- from Doug Smith to who or what position?
- To his bus -- his supervisor, which I believe at the
- 7 time was Gary Buchanan, the business unit manager.
- Okay. All right. And then -- is it correct then that
- 9 they should be making an examination as to whether or
- not the job ought to be exempt or non-exempt?
- A1 There -- there would hopefully be some review if there
- was an issue, a question about the status.
- $Q_3$  Okay. All right. And then -- this could be a
- multiple question, but would there be paper -- would
- or should there be paperwork to commemorate that
- examination for exempt/non-exempt status?
- 17 There may or may not be, depending upon the complexity
- of the issue.
- Qo Okay. From the point of view of your job, would you
- find it desirable if there was?
- A₁ Yes.
- Q2 Okay.
- A3 Yes.
- Q4 And from the point of view of somebody else trying to
- decide what happened, would you agree that having commemorative paperwork would be helpful?

- A It would be helpful, yes.
- Q Okay. You may have answered this question for me
- already, but to be clear, are you currently familiar
- 4 with the position description for safety specialist
- and safety supervisor?
- A Am I familiar with the job descriptions?
- 6 Sure. Yes.
- A No.
- Q Okay. All right. Are you familiar with either of
- 10 them?
- A<sub>1</sub> The one that you just provided.....
- Q2 Okay. Because it just.....
- A3 .....yes, although I didn't review it, you know.
- Q4 It just passed by you?
- As Yes.
- $Q_6$  Okay. Beyond that -- okay. Put that one aside. Are
- you familiar with the safety specialist job
- 18 description?
- The last one I reviewed was in the Zuber case.
- Qo Okay. All right. Are you aware of -- or if you can
- answer the question, okay, what's the differences
- between the duties of the safety supervisor and the
- safety specialist, if that's within your knowledge?
- Again, I don't know what the safety supervisor
- actually did on a day-to-day basis.
- Q Okay. And the person or persons to address those

- types of questions to would be Mr. Smith, Mr. Gilbert
- or whoever filled those positions, and perhaps Mr.
- 3 Buchanan....
- A Yes.
- ♀ ....or Mr. Buchanan's job? All right. Very good.
- You have fairly extensive experience in, I want to say
- human relations, it's human resources, right? And we
- 8 went....
- A Yes.
- Qo Okay. All right. And that's -- you've been with the
- department at APC since '94?
- Again, I work for ASRC Energy Services and I when I
- hired on it was Natchiq.
- Q4 Okay.
- And APC is a subsidiary of Natchiq.
- $Q_6$  Okay. But you....
- A7 But, yes, I've been with.....
- Qg You've been in HR.....
- Ag .....the organization.
- Q<sub>0</sub> .....since you've been here in '94?
- Q2 Prior to that, you were at Marathon for.....
- Marathon Oil.
- Q4 And you were in HR for some number of years before
- 25 that?
- A Yes.

- And you -- is -- your training isn't initially in HR,
- right, it's something else? Am I.....
- A No, it is.
- Q Oh, okay. All right. So you've got a degree in labor
- 5 relations?
- A Yes.
- A 1980.
- Q Okay. So you've been in labor relations, human
- 10 relations for your career, is that right?
- A₁ Yes.
- $Q_2$  Okay.
- MS. ZOBEL: Human resources.
- MR. COVELL: Human -- I'm sorry, human
- resources. That's why I always like calling it personnel. I just never was able to make the switch. Okay.
- MS. ZOBEL: A big difference.
- MR. COVELL: Yeah. Uh-huh. HR/ER, but that
- might be emergency room, so -- all right.
- MS. ZOBEL: We could call it HR.
- MR. COVELL: HR.
- A2 Sure.
- MR. COVELL: HR. I'll try to work with that.
- MS. ZOBEL: That works with either human
- relations or human resources.
  - MR. COVELL: There you go.

- 1 MS. ZOBEL: So you don't have to worry about which one you're referring to.
- MR. COVELL: All right.
- A good point.
- Q (By Mr. Covell) Do you feel that you're competent to
- 6 make determinations as to whether or not a position a
- 7 position ought to be exempt or non-exempt for purposes
- g of overtime?
- A Given the proper background information on specific
- activities of the position, and being able to
- adequately compare that with the wage and hour
- regulations, and in consultation with job site
- personnel, yes.
- Q4 Okay. Do you feel that the people in the field who
- make these decisions about exempt/non-exempt are
- 16 competent to make those decisions?
- MS. ZOBEL: Objection, overly broad.
- Qg You can answer.
- MS. ZOBEL: The people in the field is broad.
- $\Delta_0$ Well, the....
- $Q_1$  (By Mr. Covell) Go ahead.
- A2 ....yeah. The -- the project supervision, again
- going through the same process that I would go
- through, consult with their support resources, yes.
- Q5 Okay. And that answer holds even recognizing they may not have the same training and experience that you do?

A	Yes.
474	100.

- Q Okay. When you do an analysis -- or you've done
- analysis of exempt/non-exempt status for overtime over
- the years, is that right?
- A Correct.
- Q Okay. When you do that, do you consider the state 20
- 7 percent test?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. Do you know whether or not the people in the
- 10 field do that?
- A1 It's part of the language in the regulations. So I
- would say they would have to if they're comparing the
- position with the wage and hour definitions of the
- 14 classifications.
- Q5 Okay. When you do that, how do you do an analysis as
- to whether or not somebody spends 20 percent of their
- time doing non-exempt work?
- Mell, again you have to get back to the day-to-day
- 19 functions of the position and analyze that.
- Qo Okay. And my understanding from talking to you this
- time and last time is that you're not up north
- watching the guy in the Carharts and the gloves do his
- job, so you don't know what they do from day-to-day,
- 24 right?
- As That's correct.
- Q Okay. So I take it you have to get that information

1	communicated to you somehow?
<u> 2</u>	Yes.
<b>9</b>	All right. And then do you do a time analysis where
4	you break down and say, this individual works a 12-
5	hour day, and four hours a day they're at task A, and
6	four hours a day they're at task B, and four hours a
7	day they're at task C, and then do the math for the
8	20-percent number?
<b>A</b>	Well, I'm not sure if it gets that detailed.
20	Okay. Tell me
<b>A</b> 1	Again, you would have to actually get out there and
12	consult with the individual job site personnel,
13	consult with the individual if appropriate that's
14	actually performing the job, and make an educated
15	decision based on the relevant wage and hour laws.
<b>Q</b> 6	Okay. Without finding out how many hours a day
17	somebody spends on a particular task, can you make a
18	reasonable analysis of whether or not they're spending
19	20 percent of their time on non-exempt duties?
<b>⊉</b> 0	I think you can.
21	Can you explain that to me?
<b>⊉</b> 2	Well, you've got a set number of hours in a day, and
23	the person doesn't do exactly the same thing every
24	single day, and you have to take a look at the
25	functions on a day-to-day basis, you know, are they
	are they filing for 10 minutes and then out in the

- field making independent decisions and applying discretion in their -- their jobs, you know.
- Well, isn't it a gross analysis of the time, saying
- 4 you file 10 minutes, and you're in the field making
- independent decisions the rest of the day, therefore I
- know something in the range of 90 or 95 percent of
- 7 your time's spent on exempt duties?
- $\mathbb{A}$  Well, that's -- that was just an example that I cited.
- Q Okay.
- Ao You know, that the -- that the process would have to
- be followed to actually analyze the position.
- Q2 Okay. But that -- isn't that a less formal
- application if you're going to analyze what somebody
- does hour-by-hour, minute-by-minute?
- As Well, again, I just use that as an example.
- Q6 Sure.
- A7 It may be a more formal process that's applied given
- the position and the need to analyze individual
- 19 functions.
- Qo Are you aware of any case in considering positions for
- classification where ACP -- APC did an hour-by-hour as
- it were analysis of what somebody did?
- As Not that I'm aware of.
- Q4 Okay. And, of course, you're aware that there's -- or
- at least there were two different sets of rules as to overtime, one under the state law, and one under the

7?

- A Yes.
- Q Okay. And are the people in the field that made these
- 4 exempt/non-exempt decisions aware of that?
- A Yes, I believe.
- Q Okay. They should be in any event?
- A They should be.
- Okay. APC kept some nature of time records for its
- employees, right? Time -- hours worked?
- An Yes.
- Q1 Okay. In this case I'd represent to you we've been
- 12 provided with two sets of time logs for Mr Gilbert.
- One set shows 10 hours a day consistently, and one set
- shows one day worked. Are you familiar with that?
- A5 No, I'm not.
- Q6 All right. Is that something that you would expect to
- see provided in this case?
- As I can't comment on that. I don't know what documents
- 19 you're referring to.
- Qo Okay. All right. Well, let me show you here.
- 21 COURT REPORTER: Would you like me to go off

# record for a moment?

- MR. COVELL: Sure. That would.....
- 24 COURT REPORTER: All right.
- 25 (Off record)
  - (On record)

# METRO COURT REPORTING

- 1 COURT REPORTER: We're back on record at 9:54.
- Q (By Mr. Covell) Mr. Boyle, I've placed in front of
- you pages that are marked APC I believe 84 through --
- I don't know, there's another -- well, to.....
- 5 MS. ZOBEL: It's 48.
- @ Forty-eight to.....
- 7 MS. ZOBEL: You're reading upside down.
- Q ....to 84 is one style of documents, and then 85 to
- 9 the end is another style of document.
- Ao Okay.
- $Q_1$  Okay. Not -- actually not....
- MS. ZOBEL: Actually I don't believe that's

qgrrect.

- MR. COVELL: Okay. That's not correct. Let
- me back -- I withdraw that question.
- Q6 (By Mr. Covell) You've got some papers in front of
- you. What's the first number on the first page in
- 18 front of you, sir?
- Ag Forty-eight.
- Qo Okay. And what's the last number on the last page in
- 21 front of you?
- A<sub>2</sub> Eighty-five.
- MS. ZOBEL: No.
- A4 Oh. 103.
- Q5 All right. And I represent to you those were disclosed to me in Natchiq's 26(A) disclosure received

# METRO COURT REPORTING

- by me around January 5th, 2004. Okay. All right. Do
- you know what those are?
- A Not specifically. I can speculate that this top
- document, 0048, is some reference to time.
- All right. Some nature of time.....
- A Yes.
- Q .....record, right? And that reflects 10 hours a day
- g consistently, is that right?
- Yes, there's a column, straight -- straight time
- 10 hours, 10.
- Q1 Okay. And it starts in January of -- or, no.....
- A2 September 2002 on this.....
- $Q_3$  Okay.
- A4 ....particular document.
- Ω<sub>5</sub> All right. And there are pages and pages that are
- 16 nearly identical to that, right?
- A7 Yes.
- Q8 All right. So it would appear that -- okay. Do you
- 19 know if that -- all right. Let's look at the second
- set of papers, there -- for whatever -- any one of
- those.
- Any one?
- Q3 Just say what number that is, if there is one. Of
- course, there isn't, right?
- As I don't see a number.

MS. ZOBEL: No, there isn't. It's been cut

# METRO COURT REPORTING

φff.

- Q (By Mr. Covell) All right. So go to the next page,
- 3 try to keep those in order, please. The next one
- 4 behind it or before it.
- A We're looking for a number?
- @ Sure.
- 7 MS. ZOBEL: Here's a number.
- Q APC 114, okay? And that reflects one hour a day
- 9 worked, right? Or, pardon me, one day worked per day
- 10 I guess.
- MS. ZOBEL: These are not in order, because we
- the last date is APC 103 that.....
- MR. COVELL: Okay.
- MS. ZOBEL: .....you had him -- and this is
- 144, so....
- MR. COVELL: Okay.
- $Q_7$  (By Mr. Covell) Apparently they're out of order, but
- in any event you're looking at 114. Does that also
- appear to be some nature of time record?
- Ao Yes. It's titled weekly time sheet.
- Q1 Okay. There you go. And as far as units per day
- worked, what does it indicate?
- A3 One.
- Q4 And would you take that to mean -- what would you take
- that to mean? One what?
- A I would assume that that represents the person worked

# METRO COURT REPORTING

- on that particular day.
- Q Okay. So it's one -- would it be fair to say one day
- 3 worked?
- A Yes.
- g Okay. And it's not one hour worked, right? We
- 6 wouldn't expect that?
- No, at -- one of the -- I mean, the columns are titled
- g days.
- Q Okay. All right.
- An Days worked. Or.....
- Q1 All right. Besides those time records, are you aware
- of any other time records that APC might have for Mr.
- 13 Gilbert?
- Not that I'm aware of.
- Q5 Okay. Mr. Gilbert submitted what might be called a
- daily log that has an indication of hours worked per
- day, varying in the ranges of 11, 12, 13, 14 hours.
- Do you have any information that would dispute his
- representation that he worked those hours?
- An I have no seen the documents you're referring to, so
- really I can't comment on it.
- Q2 Okay. Would you like to? Would that be helpful in
- answering the question?
- A4 Yes.
- Q5 All right. So why don't we get this back here, and I'll get that out of your way.

- 1 MR. COVELL: We're not going to mark that as an exhibit.
- Q Okay. I'm going to hand you what's in discovery
- 4 entitled Plaintiff's Initial Disclosures, and I'll
- refer you to any number of these pages. Ms. Zobel has
- a copy there for you. Does that appear to be a day
- 7 planner or log looking material?
- 8 MS. ZOBEL: You're on page 87?
- Q Just pick one with a bunch of entries. Okay. And
- we're looking at page 87. Have you seen this document
- or a similar form of this document in this case
- 12 before?
- $A_3$  No.
- $Q_4$  Okay. Do you see how, for instance, on Tuesday,
- August 6th, there's a 12 written here?
- A<sub>6</sub> Yes.
- Q7 And then on the 7th, 13.5, and then on the 8th, 12,
- and then on the 9th, 14, and then on Saturday the 1st,
- 19 12, and on Sunday the 11th, 13?
- Ao Yes.
- Q1 All right. I represent to you that Mr. Gilbert says
- those are the hours he worked that day. And I had
- asked you if you had any records besides the ones we
- looked at in your disclosure that would indicate the
- 25 hours he had worked when he worked for you?
- A Not that I'm aware of.

Okay. And besides written records, do you have, or --Q MR. COVELL: Let me withdraw that. 2. Does APC have any information that would contradict Mr. Gilbert's assertion he worked particular hours on 4 particular days? 5 Not that I'm aware of. There we go, we're back to the Thank you. other glasses. 8 MR. COVELL: Why don't we go off for just a 9 second. COURT REPORTER: Sure. 11 (Off record) 12 (On record) 13 COURT REPORTER: All right. We're back on 14 record at 10:04. (By Mr. Covell) Earlier we talked about your 26 involvement in the case, and I think you said 17 something to the extent of very little, and not -- or 18 to be redundant, to be thorough, what do you have to 19 do with this case? 20 I'm not sure. **A**1 **Q**2 Okay. What have you done on this case so far? Nothing. **A**3

# METRO COURT REPORTING

Other than read my previous deposition.

Have you been involved.....

Okay.

94

**A**5

Q

<b>A</b>	And I think I have worked with Counsel on
2	documentation requests and discovery requests.
9	Okay.
4	Although I don't even remember what what was
5	generated, because most of the material had already
6	been submitted.
<b>Q</b>	Okay. Do you know, besides the what I might call
8	mundane materials, the payroll record, his personnel
9	file, do you know if there are any papers that exist
10	that concern the classification of the safety
11	supervisor position as exempt or non-exempt?
<b>⊉</b> 2	I'm not aware of any.
₽3	Okay. And is it correct that if such papers existed,
14	one would expect to find them in your office?
<b>⊉</b> 5	Not necessarily.
<b>Q</b> 6	Okay.
<b>⊉</b> 7	No.
₽8	In your prior deposition I think you indicated
19	something to the effect that you or your office would
20	be the central point for the gathering of papers of
21	that nature, do you recollect saying that?
<b>∄</b> 2	I think that was in reference to discovery requests.
<b>2</b> 3	Okay. All right. If there are papers that
24	commemorate a review of the exempt/non-exempt status
25	of the safety supervisor, would you would the
	places you expect to find them be your office, or in

- the appropriate field office?
- A They could be in either one.
- Okay. Those would be the places you would look?
- A That's where I would look, yes.
- All right. Okay. So besides what you've already told
- me, that's been your extent of involvement in this
- 7 matter?
- A Yes, I've had very little very little involvement.
- Q Okay. Believe me, there are times I want a no answer,
- 10 you know. No -- yeah, that's better.
- MS. ZOBEL: Is that our phone?
- MR. COVELL: Yeah, I'm ignoring it.
- MS. ZOBEL: Okay.
- MR. COVELL: But thank you.
- (Whispered conversation)
- 16 (Pause)
- Q7 (By Mr. Covell) Okay. During the course of -- okay
- at one point you did get involved in the analysis of
- the exempt/non-exempt status of the safety specialist
- 20 position, is that right? Or wrong?
- An I don't believe I did.
- **Q**2 Okay.
- A3 I think Mark Nelson was performing that -- that
- initial review along with several other positions at
- 25 the time.
- Q All right. And when that was going on, you were in

- the loop in Mark Allen -- Mark Nelson's activities?
- Not specifically, no.
- Q Okay. Let me hand you, and these should be Z's, a
- 4 memo....
- MR. COVELL: Here, why don't we go -- what
- have we got? 3?
- 7 COURT REPORTER: B-3.
- MR. COVELL: B-3. Let me stick that on there.
- 9 (Deposition Exhibit B-3 marked)
- MR. COVELL: Here's a copy for you, Ms. Zobel.
- Q1 (By Mr. Covell) A memo from Mark Nelson to Anne
- 12 Hippe, and I -- if -- don't wrack your brain, but does
- this look familiar to you? If it doesn't, I've got
- some other paperwork that will probably refer back to
- this.
- A<sub>6</sub> Yes. Yes, it does.
- Q7 Okay. And I'm trying to speed things up. Was this
- something that sort of was at the beginning of Mr.
- 19 Nelson looking onto whether jobs are exempt or non-
- 20 exempt?
- Al Well, from what I can recall, there was an article
- attached to this that's referenced as the Forbes
- 23 Magazine attached article.
- Q4 Right.
- And there was a particular case that addressed exempt status, and I think he had some questions about that

1	which generated this.
Q	Okay. And you saw that at some point relatively
3	speaking contemporaneous to December '96?
<b>4</b>	I don't recall exactly when, but it was ultimately
5	forwarded on to me, yes.
8	Okay. All right. And did that eventually and
7	MS. ZOBEL: I'm sorry, could I ask what B-2
ģs?	
9	MR. COVELL: B-2 is G-2, isn't it?
10	MS. ZOBEL: Oh, all right. All right. Thank
γφu.	
12	MR. COVELL: All right.
13	MS. ZOBEL: I didn't mean to interrupt you.
My apol	ogies.
15	MR. COVELL: I would rather get it straight
<b>n</b> ⊗w tha	an be pulling my hair out at three in the morning.
17	MS. ZOBEL: Yeah, I'm sitting here with a
18	
19	MR. COVELL: Yeah.
20	MS. ZOBEL:and a 3.
21	MR. COVELL: Yeah.
<b>2</b> 2	(By Mr. Covell) Okay. All right. And then do you
23	recollect that that generated sort of subsequent
24	follow-on correspondence between yourself/Mr. Nelson,
25	Mr Nelson/Randy Carr? And I'll get you some papers
	here, but I'm trying to work along. Does that ring

1	any bells with you?
<u> </u>	Yes, I'm not sure specifically if this memo generated
3	the subsequent activity, but on or about that time
4	frame there were several issues going on that were
5	being reviewed.
<u>ି</u>	Okay. All right. Let me hand you another one, a
7	letter dated December 26, '96. Come on now.
8	MS. ZOBEL: I believe you've already produced
<b>5</b> hat	••
10	MR. COVELL: Oh, that's that one.
11	MS. ZOBEL:Counsel, that's Exhibit 1.
12	MR. COVELL: Okay.
13	MS. ZOBEL: B-1.
14	MR. COVELL: Excellent. Thank you. All
ŗ <b>ģ</b> ght.	
16	MS. ZOBEL: You don't have that, Mister
<b>全</b> 7	Oh.
18	MS. ZOBEL:Chris. B-1, please?
19	COURT REPORTER: I do not have B-1.
20	MR. COVELL: It's right here.
<b>A</b> 1	Isn't it? Yeah.
22	MS. ZOBEL: Oh, all right.
23	MR. COVELL: Okay.
24	MS. ZOBEL: I'm sorry.
<b>Q</b> 5	(By Mr. Covell) All right. So this B-1 letter is
	from you, and if you look at that last sentence of the

1	first paragraph, it says, in addition, it's
2	appropriate to review whether personnel currently paid
3	as exempt are properly classified. It says that,
4	right?
<b>A</b>	Under number 1?
8	Right
彝	The first
Ø	right there.
9	MS. ZOBEL: We have a different letter.
<b>Q</b> 0	Okay. December 26, '96.
<b>型</b> 1	Yes.
12	MS. ZOBEL: This isn't a December 26th, '96
1 <b>g</b> tter.	
14	MR. COVELL: I've got it here.
<b>A</b> 5	That's what I've got.
16	MR. COVELL: Okay. And what do you have?
17	MS. ZOBEL: The same thing. You gave it to
Ţę.	
19	MR. COVELL: Okay. All right.
<b>2</b> 0	(By Mr. Covell) And looking at the last sentence of
21	the first full paragraph, can you read that for me?
<b>⊉</b> 2	The main issue is whether the day rate is an
23	appropriate form of payment under wage and hour laws.
24	In addition, it is appropriate to review it is
25	appropriate to review whether personnel currently paid
	as exempt are properly classified.

- Q Okay. So that was a direction to -- okay. Who are
- these folks at the top of the page there, to?
- A Don Dieckmeyer, Scott Eliason, Dick Frederick, Lee
- Gabrielson, Jack Laasch -- just business unit heads.
- Q Okay. Unit managers.....
- A Yes.
- A Not -- not all out in the field though.
- Q Okay. But.....
- $Q_1$  Okay. And then this is -- the -- I think this -- what
- -- the letter is on a day rate issue, but you're
- saying also, take a look at your people and see
- whether they're exempt or non-exempt, right?
- As Yes.
- $Q_6$  Okay. And then you say here are the attachments,
- here's some guidelines to work with that we talked
- 18 about earlier?
- Ag Yes.
- Qo Okay. And that's December 26th, which is the -- you
- 21 know, the end of -- the day after Christmas. You were
- working?
- As I could have been, yes.
- Q4 All right. Did you get.....
- As Darn it. Maybe we can talk.

MS. ZOBEL: Oh, Chris, you didn't say that.

# METRO COURT REPORTING

A reall. Strike that	A	Yeah.	Strike	that
----------------------	---	-------	--------	------

- MS. ZOBEL: Yeah.
- 3 MR. COVELL: I'll stipulate to that being

stricken from the record.

- Q (By Mr. Covell) Okay. So it's some weeks after that
- that Anne Hippe memo, which is B-4 [sic] I believe.
- A Yes.
- Q Right. Okay. And then subsequent to that, April 4,
- 9 '97, we get another letter from you.
- 10 MR. COVELL: Will you mark that sequentially,

please, Madame Clerk.

- 12 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. You just referred
- to something as B-4, this is B-4.
- MR. COVELL: Okay. I stand corrected.
- 15 COURT REPORTER: We do not have a B-4.
- MR. COVELL: Whatever the Anne Hippe letter of

1December 7, '96.....

- 18 COURT REPORTER: That's B-3.
- MR. COVELL: B-3.
- 20 COURT REPORTER: All right.
- MR. COVELL: That's what I meant to say.
- 22 COURT REPORTER: Right now we're going to mark

B34.

- MR. COVELL: That's what we want.
- 25 (Deposition Exhibit 4 marked)

MS. ZOBEL: And this should also be marked as

# METRO COURT REPORTING

<u>a</u> Z		
2	MR. COVELL: Excellent.	
3	MS. ZOBEL:APC 010	
4	MR. COVELL: Yes.	
5	MS. ZOBEL:80 180.	
6	MR. COVELL: Thank you. And do we have any	
9ther ones here that should be Z's? I think we		
8	MS. ZOBEL: I think Madam Clerk has put a Z on	
gvery one of them so far.		
10	MR. COVELL: Excellent.	
11	COURT REPORTER: Yes.	
12	MR. COVELL: Thank you.	
13	MS. ZOBEL: You may want to put them on yours.	
14	MR. COVELL: I want to, but I can't walk and	
çhew gum at	the same time, so I'm not getting there. But	
ţ <b>h</b> ank you.		
17	MS. ZOBEL: You're welcome.	
<b>⊉</b> 8 (By	Mr. Covell) Okay. All right. Mr. Boyle, looking	
19 at I	3-4, this is continuing correspondence along the	
20 veir	n of day rate and wage and hour classification, is	
21 that	t right?	
∄2 Yes	•	
Q3 Okay	<i>Y</i> •	

to Anne Hippe, Toby Osborn.

**⊉**4

25

I'm not -- however, I'm not sure if it's connected

directly with the December 7th memo from Mark Nelson

$\mathfrak{Q}$	Okay. Is it either indirectly connected or at least
2	addressing as far as exemption goes the same subject
3	matter?
<b>4</b>	Well, it's addressing this the April 4th letter
5	is addressing specifically the appropriateness of day
6	rate.
<b>Q</b>	Okay. Well, I'm looking at the second paragraph.
8	Alaska has no specific wage okay, that's fine.
9	Thank you for helping me here. Looking at the second
10	paragraph, it says why don't you read that for us,
11	please?
<b></b> 2	Alaska has no specific wage and hour law addressing
13	the payment of a day rate to exempt employees. Of
14	course, the first step an employer must take is to
15	properly classify an employee as exempt, parenthesis,
16	not eligible for overtime, or non-exempt. I've
17	previously provided some information on this subject
18	and would recommend we again look at the foreman and
19	similarly classified employees to ensure their status
20	can stand up to the exemption test.
<b>2</b> 1	Okay. Is it fair to say that that paragraph is a
22	reiteration of the sentence in the April 4th letter
23	that says, I have previously hang on. We're in the
24	April 4th letter. In the perhaps B-1 exhibit, the
25	December 26, '96 letter, in addition, it is
	appropriate to review whether personnel currently paid

- as exempt are properly classified. Do you want me to
- 2 repeat it?
- Yes, please.
- Q Okay. The second paragraph of the April 4 letter, is
- j it fair to characterize that as a follow up to the
- 6 December 26th letter at the last part of the first
- 7 paragraph that talks about whether people are properly
- g classified as exempt or non-exempt?
- Again, I don't think there is a direction connection
- between the December 26th letter and this April 4th
- 11 letter.
- $Q_2$  Okay.
- A3 This -- the April 4th letter appears to be
- specifically addressing foremen, and this is -- this
- 15 -- the December 26th letter seems to be addressing
- just the general issue of exempt versus non-exempt.
- Q7 Okay. So December 26th is more general, and April 7
- [sic] is more specific as to foreman?
- Ag Based on that paragraph that I read, yes.
- Q<sub>0</sub> Okay. All right. Would -- is it reasonable to think
- a safety supervisor for purposes of analysis for
- 22 classification as exempt or non-exempt as a foreman?
- As I would disagree with that.
- Q4 Okay.
- Based on the little knowledge I have of both those positions and what they do.

- Q Okay.
- A They're entirely different functions.
- And what's the difference in the functions?
- The foreman may be actual -- they could be working
- foremen actually down -- down there working with the
- 6 -- with the crews, clearly a non-exempt position in my
- opinion, versus a safety supervisor who, you know, may
- 8 have other duties.
- Q Okay. But a safety supervisor as well could be down
- there working with the crews as well, right?
- A<sub>1</sub> To perform functions? No.
- Q2 Couldn't be?
- A3 No.
- Q4 A safety supervisor couldn't be doing a.....
- They're not going to be down there digging ditches,
- they're not going to be down there hammering nails.
- Q7 And neither would a safety specialist, right?
- Ag I wouldn't think so.
- Qo Okay. But a safety supervisor -- well, do you know if
- 20 safety supervisors at least at times did the same work
- as a safety specialist?
- A2 I don't know.
- Q3 Okay. Would that surprise you if that was the case?
- A4 No.
- Q5 Okay. All right. Is it fair to say that as far as guys that pound nails or turn wrenches, have a first

- line supervisor and that's the foreman?
- A They've got someone that they report to.
- Q Okay. And.....
- A I don't know if it would be the foreman or some other
- 5 position.
- Well, what other position might it be?
- A There could be other lead positions.
- Okay. And what might they be called?
- A Lead.
- $Q_0$  Okay. All right. And are they a separate job
- description from mechanic or plumber?
- $A_2$  Yes, it may be.
- Q3 Okay. Okay. All right. And at this time did you
- have a concern that people in lead positions may or
- may not be properly classified as exempt or non-
- 16 exempt?
- 1 don't believe there was a concern on those
- positions, because they were classified as non-exempt.
- Qo Okay. And then is it correct that the foreman as far
- as exempt and non-exempt go were a mixed?
- Q2 Okay. But in any event, this letter is saying is take
- a look at those jobs and figure it out, guys?
- A4 Yes.
- Q5 Okay. All right. Okay. And had somebody gone and looked at the safety supervisor position in receiving

this letter, that would have been okay with you, 1 right? 2. MS. ZOBEL: I'm going to object, because I 3 don't think that position was even in existence at that time. MR. COVELL: Do you know when the position 5 game into existence? MS. ZOBEL: You can ask Doug Smith, he'll 7 know. Okay. All right. MR. COVELL: 9 (By Mr. Covell) Had the safety specialist --QΩ supervisor position existed at that time, and somebody 11 got ahold of this memo and examined that, whether 12 they're exempt or non-exempt, would that have been 13 okay with you? 14 I don't understand your question. **A**5 All right. **Q**6 **₽**7 What are you.... Somebody's out in the field, Doug Smith or Buchanan or **Q**8 Mark Nelson, and they get this memo, and they read 19 it.... 20 **⊉**1 Uh-huh. **Q**2 .....and they say, yeah, Mr. Boyle sent me a memo, I should look at foremen and see if they're classified 23 right. Okay. And they go and say -- whether you 2.4 intend it or not, they say, well, foremen, safety 25 supervisor, I'm going to look at the safety supervisor

# METRO COURT REPORTING

1	position to see if they're classified properly or not.
2	Had that happened, would that be okay with you as HR?
<u> </u>	Well, you would be asking me to speculate. This memo
4	may may be a key to individuals that, hey, well,
5	let's while we're at take a look at other positions.
<u>୍</u> ଡି	Okay. All right. Okay. All right. Now actually if
7	you turn to the second page of that and look under
8	recommendations, the first sentence says,
9	recommendations relative to date rate issues, but the
10	first recommendation is review all occupations where
11	there may be questions concerning whether they are
12	properly classified as exempt, non-exempt, foremen and
13	other personnel whose actual job responsibilities and
14	duties may not meet the overtime test. Would it be
15	reasonable for somebody to take that directive to say,
16	we should look at the safety supervisor position and
17	review it for exempt/non-exempt status?
18	MS. ZOBEL: Assuming that it existed.
Ω9	(By Mr. Covell) Assuming that
<b>⊉</b> 0	Yes.
21	it existed. All right.
<b>⊉</b> 2	Assuming.
<b>2</b> 3	Okay. Okay. When if a job doesn't exist and it's
24	created, is it the policy of APC to examine it for
25	exempt or non-exempt status?
A	Yes, they should have reviewed or at least considered

Okay. All right. And the last page of that exhibit, the second to last paragraph indicates in the second line, federal wage and hour law is very complex. Do you agree with that?  I do. Okay. And in reading your deposition, did you see that last time we took your deposition we found a number of different instances where there were comments like that in the materials we dealt in that case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult the Department of Labor and comments about it being complex?  Yes. Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't changed?  No. Okay. And right. All right. Let me hand you a letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked, please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	_	the the proper alogaification
the second to last paragraph indicates in the second line, federal wage and hour law is very complex. Do you agree with that?  loo. Okay. And in reading your deposition, did you see that last time we took your deposition we found a number of different instances where there were comments like that in the materials we dealt in that case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult the Department of Labor and comments about it being complex?  Yes. Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't changed?  No. Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked, please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	1	the the proper classification.
line, federal wage and hour law is very complex. Do you agree with that?  lido.  Okay. And in reading your deposition, did you see that last time we took your deposition we found a number of different instances where there were comments like that in the materials we dealt in that case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult the Department of Labor and comments about it being complex?  Yes.  Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't changed?  No.  Read Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked, please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	<u>Q</u>	Okay. All right. And the last page of that exhibit,
you agree with that?  I do.  Okay. And in reading your deposition, did you see that last time we took your deposition we found a number of different instances where there were comments like that in the materials we dealt in that case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult the Department of Labor and comments about it being complex?  Yes.  Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't changed?  No.  Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked, please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	3	the second to last paragraph indicates in the second
Okay. And in reading your deposition, did you see that last time we took your deposition we found a number of different instances where there were comments like that in the materials we dealt in that case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult the Department of Labor and comments about it being complex?  Yes.  Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't changed?  No.  Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked, please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	4	line, federal wage and hour law is very complex. Do
Okay. And in reading your deposition, did you see that last time we took your deposition we found a number of different instances where there were comments like that in the materials we dealt in that case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult the Department of Labor and comments about it being complex?  Yes.  Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't changed?  No.  Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked, please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	5	you agree with that?
that last time we took your deposition we found a number of different instances where there were comments like that in the materials we dealt in that the case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult the Department of Labor and comments about it being complex?  Yes.  Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't changed?  No.  Row No.  May. Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked, please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	<b>∂</b>	I do.
number of different instances where there were  comments like that in the materials we dealt in that  case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult  the Department of Labor and comments about it being  complex?  Yes.  Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't  changed?  No.  Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a  letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,  please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	<b>Q</b>	Okay. And in reading your deposition, did you see
comments like that in the materials we dealt in that  case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult  the Department of Labor and comments about it being  complex?  Yes.  Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't  changed?  No.  Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a  letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,  please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	8	that last time we took your deposition we found a
case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult the Department of Labor and comments about it being complex?  Yes.  Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't changed?  No.  Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked, please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	9	number of different instances where there were
the Department of Labor and comments about it being  complex?  Yes.  Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't  changed?  No.  Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a  letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,  please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	10	comments like that in the materials we dealt in that
Complex?  A4 Yes.  Q5 Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't changed?  A7 No.  Q8 Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  20 MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked, please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	11	case, saying this is a complex area, you can consult
A4 Yes.  Q5 Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't  16 changed?  A7 No.  Q8 Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a  19 letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  20 MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,  Q1ease. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	12	the Department of Labor and comments about it being
Q5 Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't  16 changed?  A7 No.  Q8 Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a  19 letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  20 MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,  Q1ease. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	13	complex?
16 changed?  A7 No.  Q8 Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a  19 letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  20 MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,  please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	<b></b> 4	Yes.
No.  Q8 Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a  19 letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  20 MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,  Q1ease. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	<b>Q</b> 5	Okay. And your answers to those questions haven't
Q8 Okay. All right. All right. Let me hand you a  19 letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  20 MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,  please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	16	changed?
letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.  MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,  please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	<b>全</b> 7	No.
MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,  please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has	28	Okay. All right. Let me hand you a
<pre>please. And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has</pre>	19	letter from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr, June 19, '97.
<del></del>	20	MR. COVELL: And let me get that marked,
	<b>p</b> lease.	And that should get a Z on it, too, as Ms. Zobel has
been so helpful in pointing out.	<b>þ</b> gen so	helpful in pointing out.

# 23 (Deposition Exhibit B-5 marked)

MR. COVELL: And we've got.....

25 COURT REPORTER: B-5 marked.

MR. COVELL: .....G-5 [sic]. Okay.

# METRO COURT REPORTING

- Q (By Mr. Covell) Are you familiar with this document,
- 2 Mr. Boyle.....
- A Yes.
- Q ....in a general way? And you saw it at -- during
- your last deposition? I represent to you I believe
- 6 you saw that during.....
- A Yes.
- Q .....your last deposition. Okay. All right. And you
- 9 -- did you see this at some point relatively
- 10 contemporaneous to June 19, '97?
- $A_1$  I don't know.
- **Q**<sub>2</sub> Okay.
- A3 I think when I first saw that was during the last
- 14 deposition.
- Q5 Okay. All right. In any event, this would appear to
- be a correspondence from Mr. Nelson to Mr. Carr who
- was then with the State Department of Labor concerning
- whether or not a materials supervisor position would
- 19 be exempt or not, right?
- Ao Yes.
- Q1 And he sent materials and asked for Mr. Carr's opinion
- on that, right?
- Ag Yes.
- Q4 Okay. All right. As far as either the safety
- specialist position and/or the safety supervisor position, assuming they existed on June 19.....

1	MS. ZOBEL: Of what year?						
2	MR. COVELL: '97.						
<b>g</b>	(By Mr. Covell) June 25, I'm sorry. APC could have						
4	sent a similar correspondence to the Department of						
5	Labor and asked for a similar determination, is that						
6	right?						
<b>₽</b>	It could have, yes.						
<b>@</b>	Okay. And to be thorough, as far as you know, that						
9	was never done?						
<b>⊉</b> 0	Not to my knowledge.						
<b>Q</b> 1	Okay. Okay. I'm sorry, and that was the June 19.						
12	Okay. Now I'm going to hand you a June 25 letter.						
13	MR. COVELL: That will be 6 I believe.						
14	(Deposition Exhibit B-6 marked)						
14 15	(Deposition Exhibit B-6 marked) COURT REPORTER: B-6 marked.						
15	COURT REPORTER: B-6 marked.						
15 16	COURT REPORTER: B-6 marked.  MR. COVELL: And that should get a Z as well.						
15 16 17	COURT REPORTER: B-6 marked.  MR. COVELL: And that should get a Z as well.  COURT REPORTER: I have placed a Z on there.						
15 16 17 18	COURT REPORTER: B-6 marked.  MR. COVELL: And that should get a Z as well.  COURT REPORTER: I have placed a Z on there.  MR. COVELL: Excellent.						
15 16 17 18 <b>Q</b> 9	COURT REPORTER: B-6 marked.  MR. COVELL: And that should get a Z as well.  COURT REPORTER: I have placed a Z on there.  MR. COVELL: Excellent.  (By Mr. Covell) All right. And do you recollect						
15 16 17 18 <b>Q</b> 9 20	COURT REPORTER: B-6 marked.  MR. COVELL: And that should get a Z as well.  COURT REPORTER: I have placed a Z on there.  MR. COVELL: Excellent.  (By Mr. Covell) All right. And do you recollect seeing this letter and the attached letter from Mr.						
15 16 17 18 <b>Q</b> 9 20 21	COURT REPORTER: B-6 marked.  MR. COVELL: And that should get a Z as well.  COURT REPORTER: I have placed a Z on there.  MR. COVELL: Excellent.  (By Mr. Covell) All right. And do you recollect seeing this letter and the attached letter from Mr.  Carr to Mr. Nelson, which is also labeled WHOL number						
15 16 17 18 <b>Q</b> 9 20 21 22	COURT REPORTER: B-6 marked.  MR. COVELL: And that should get a Z as well.  COURT REPORTER: I have placed a Z on there.  MR. COVELL: Excellent.  (By Mr. Covell) All right. And do you recollect seeing this letter and the attached letter from Mr.  Carr to Mr. Nelson, which is also labeled WHOL number 122?						
15 16 17 18 <b>Q</b> 9 20 21 22 23	COURT REPORTER: B-6 marked.  MR. COVELL: And that should get a Z as well.  COURT REPORTER: I have placed a Z on there.  MR. COVELL: Excellent.  (By Mr. Covell) All right. And do you recollect  seeing this letter and the attached letter from Mr.  Carr to Mr. Nelson, which is also labeled WHOL number  122?  (Pause)						

- Okay. And did you see that relatively contemporaneous
- 2 to June 26th, 1997?
- A I think I saw that at the time of the Zuber case
- 4 deposition.
- Q Okay.
- As far as I recall.
- Okay. All right. So in APC producing this letter
- from Mr. Carr back in '97, do you know if it came from
- g field files or from HR files?
- And Randy Carr's letter?
- $Q_1$  Right.
- A2 I don't recall where it came from.
- Q3 If you can answer the question, where would you expect
- in 2003 relatively speaking a 1997 letter would have
- come from? This 1997 letter would have come from?
- A<sub>6</sub> In 2003?
- MS. ZOBEL: You're talking about in production
- fgom -- in the Zuber case?
- MR. COVELL: Right. Right.
- Ao I don't recall.
- Q1 Okay. That's fine. That's fine.
- A2 It was a Mark Nelson letter.
- Q3 All right. You would expect -- is it fair to say you
- 24 would have expected it either to come from HR files or
- 25 from the field files?
- A Yes.

- Q Okay. All right. All right. And this WHOL letter --
- well, let me ask you this. Do you know if APC has any
- 3 other WHOL letters?
- 4 MS. ZOBEL: Are you talking about an at all period or relative.....
- 6 MR. COVELL: Sure. Yeah.
- 7 MS. ZOBEL: ....relative to this case?
- MR. COVELL: At all period.
- There may have been others that Mark Nelson received.
- $Q_0$  (By Mr. Covell) Okay.
- $A_1$  I -- I can't cite them specifically.
- $Q_2$  Okay.
- Again, it would have been relative to what was
- 14 produced in the Zuber case.
- $Q_5$  Okay.
- A6 I haven't reviewed any of the exhibits.
- Q7 Well, backing up into a broader question, do you have
- an HR file or binder that says APC WHOL letters or
- 19 something similar?
- No, I -- I don't have anything like that.
- Q1 Okay. All right. Is this something that you either
- would like to or think you ought to have on file at
- 23 HR?
- A4 It would be nice to have those on file. Yes.
- Q5 Okay. All right. But as far as you know, you don't, is.....

<b></b>	No.						
<b>Q</b>	that right? Okay. All right. Drawing your						
3	attention well, drawing your attention to Mr.						
4	Nelson's portion of that exhibit, that last paragraph						
5	there, it says, please respond in writing to give us a						
6	definition as to how it works, and the cautions of						
7	classifying an employee the supervisor as a						
8	supervisor. We can easily find the classifications						
9	for administrative, professional and executive, but do						
10	not see a clear path for supervisors. And I guess I						
11	should have started at the at the last sentence of						
12	the above paragraph. The discussion surrounding						
13	supervisors as being exempt from overtime pay, paren,						
14	premium pay, close paren, but yet have to be paid for						
15	all hours worked has been difficult to pull from the						
16	regulations. Do you see that text?						
<b></b>	Yes.						
28	Okay. And that concerns an issue that and is it						
19	correct that that concerns an issue that even if						
20	someone is exempt, if they're a supervisor, they're						
21	entitled to be paid for all hours worked, is that so?						
<b>⊉</b> 2	There's a reference to that language in in the						
23	regulations but the interpretation of how that's						
24	applied is left for interpretation.						
<b>2</b> 5	Okay. All right. And then Mr. Carr responds to that						
	in his letter, and is it fair to say that Mr. Carr						

1	essentially says that that's the case, that a					
2	supervisor has to be paid for all hours worked, but					
3	doesn't have to be given premium pay?					
<b>A</b>	Can you cite where you're referencing that?					
<b>©</b>	Sure. You bet.					
6	MS. ZOBEL: Why don't we go off the record and					
give him an opportunity						
8	MR. COVELL: Yeah, that's fine.					
9	MS. ZOBEL:to read the letter?					
10	MR. COVELL: That works. And					
11	(Off record)					
12	(On record)					
13	COURT REPORTER: We're back on the record at					
14:39.						
<b>Q</b> 5	(By Mr. Covell) Mr. Boyle, we were looking for an					
16	area of the Randy Carr letter, and I'm speculating					
17	you're about to direct me to that next to last					
18	paragraph of the letter, is it					
<b>⊉</b> 9	Correct.					
<b>2</b> 0	Okay. All right. And so that letter indicates that					
21	supervisors should bet paid for every hour worked, but					
22	they don't get premium pay, i.e., half time again on					
23	those extra hours, is that right?					
<b>2</b> 4	Let's clarify the paragraph we're referring to. Does					
25	it start out with exempt administrative or the					
	explanation?					

<b>Q</b>	Well, let me rephrase the question. You were going to						
2	refer to part of the letter and respond to my						
3	question. What part of the letter were you going to						
4	refer to?						
<u>₿</u>	The second to the last paragraph, exempt						
6	administrative employees.						
<b>Q</b>	All right. And what direction does that give to Mr.						
8	Nelson and APC as to how to pay employees under the						
9	state wage and hour act?						
<b>⊉</b> 0	It just references that exempt admin I can just						
11	read it. I mean, that's the direction						
12	(indiscernible - simultaneous speech)						
<b>Q</b> 3	answer is it says what it says, is that the						
	answer?						
14	answer?						
14 <b>∆</b> 5	Yes.						
<b>⊉</b> 5	Yes.						
<b>Δ</b> 5 <b>Q</b> 6	Yes. Okay. All right. That's fine. All right. What						
Φ5 Ω6 17	Yes.  Okay. All right. That's fine. All right. What action did APC take to pay all to pay supervisors						
<b>1</b> 5 <b>2</b> 6 <b>1</b> 7	Yes.  Okay. All right. That's fine. All right. What action did APC take to pay all to pay supervisors for all hours worked in response to this WHOL 122, if						
♣5 <b>1</b> 6 17 18 19	Yes.  Okay. All right. That's fine. All right. What action did APC take to pay all to pay supervisors for all hours worked in response to this WHOL 122, if any?						
♣5 №6 17 18 19 ♣0	Yes.  Okay. All right. That's fine. All right. What action did APC take to pay all to pay supervisors for all hours worked in response to this WHOL 122, if any?  I don't know what actions Mark Nelson took. This was						
♣5 №6 17 18 19 ♣0 21	Yes.  Okay. All right. That's fine. All right. What action did APC take to pay all to pay supervisors for all hours worked in response to this WHOL 122, if any?  I don't know what actions Mark Nelson took. This was referring to the materials supervisors.						
♣5 №6 17 18 19 ♣0 21 №2	Yes.  Okay. All right. That's fine. All right. What action did APC take to pay all to pay supervisors for all hours worked in response to this WHOL 122, if any?  I don't know what actions Mark Nelson took. This was referring to the materials supervisors.  Okay. That's not my question. Let me be more						
♣5 №6 17 18 19 ♣0 21 №2 23	Yes.  Okay. All right. That's fine. All right. What action did APC take to pay all to pay supervisors for all hours worked in response to this WHOL 122, if any?  I don't know what actions Mark Nelson took. This was referring to the materials supervisors.  Okay. That's not my question. Let me be more specific. I take this to say that you need to pay as						

1	mean?
<u> </u>	I would disagree with your I think what you're
3	getting at. I would disagree with that.
Q	Okay. What would you take it to mean?
<b>B</b>	If what what this is saying is if the
6	individual's an exempt employee, if if they're
7	working you do have to pay them for for the time
8	that they work and whatever that particular daily or
9	weekly pay rate is, or pay amount is, that's what you
10	have to pay them. You're not required to pay premium
11	pay, time and a half.
<b>Q</b> 2	Right. But you are to pay if somebody works
<b>⊉</b> 3	But it doesn't mean that you pay the person, if
14	they're working 18 hours in a day, it doesn't mean
15	that you pay them each and every hour that they
16	actually work. As a as a definition of an exempt
17	employee, they get paid a straight weekly rate, a
18	daily rate.
<b>Q</b> 9	Okay. So a person might interpret this to mean if
20	they got a day rate for 12 hours for well, pick a
21	number I guess, \$475 for a day rate, and they worked
22	16 hours, that they ought to get an additional four
23	hours at the rage of 475 divided my 12?
<b>⊉</b> 4	That would not be my interpretation, no.
<b>2</b> 5	Okay. But the question is, not I'm not saying
	that's your interpretation. A person might interpret

- that to be what this is saying, is that fair to say?
- A I disagree. You're asking me to interpret your
- 3 interpretation.
- Q No, I'm asking you to interpret what it says here, and
- 5 I'm asking you, if somebody were to make that
- interpretation of this, would that be a reasonable
- 7 interpretation?
- MS. ZOBEL: Asked and answered.
- Q I'll ask it.....
- An Exactly. I was just going to say, I answered that
- already, and that would be my.....
- $Q_2$  And your answer....
- A3 ....interpretation.
- $Q_4$  .....is that, no, that would not be a reasonable
- 15 interpretation?
- A<sub>6</sub> That's correct.
- Q7 Okay. All right. So is it correct to say -- well,
- okay. Is it correct -- yeah, is it correct to say
- then that APC took no action to pay supervisors pay
- for all hours worked? Or let me put it this way. APC
- didn't change what it was doing in paying its
- 22 employees based upon the advice in this letter?
- MS. ZOBEL: I'm going to object. I think he's asked -- you've asked and answered that, and he said he did
- ngt know what action was taken in response to this letter.
- Q (By Mr. Covell) All right. Go ahead and answer the

1 question.
-------------

- And that would.....
- Q Thank you.
- Yeah, that would have been my response. And.....
- Q Your response is you don't know?
- I don't know what steps Mark Nelson may have taken as
- 7 a result of this letter.
- Q Okay. If APC had done that -- how many people do you
- 9 have who might fit that category?
- $A_0$  What category?
- $Q_1$  The category of people who are exempt but under the
- interpretation I suggested would be entitled to
- 13 additional monies?
- None if they're classified as exempt. They get paid
- what they're set up to get paid, whether it's a day
- rate or a weekly rate or a monthly rate.
- Q7 Okay. But if the correct interpretation of this is
- contrary to what yours is, and that they were entitled
- to additional monies, how many people would fit in
- 20 that category?
- Q2 Okay. Can you estimate?
- No, sir, I can't.
- Q4 Okay. If APC decided, and they said, Mr. Boyle, we'd
- like -- you've worked for us for years, we believe you're wrong on that issue, we believe it means we

- have to pay additional monies, and we're going to pay
- additional monies. Is that something you would have
- 3 been involved in or been aware of?
- A If that determination was made, I'm sure many people
- would have been involved, including myself yes.
- So had APC paid additional monies pursuant to this,
- that's something you would have known about?
- A I mean, if.....
- 9 MS. ZOBEL: It calls for speculation.
- Again, if it's.....
- MR. COVELL: That's -- I'll let him.....
- A<sub>2</sub> .....if it's a -- if it's a.....
- Q3 (By Mr. Covell) You can answer.
- A4 ....one off, probably not.
- Q5 All right.
- A6 But if it's a -- you know, it affects many, many
- people, and that was your original question. You said
- if all these people were all of a sudden falling under
- this interpretation, would I be involved, then, yes.
- 20 If it's a one off situation, probably not.
- $Q_1$  And what does one off mean?
- A2 You'd have to go back to the number of materials
- supervisors of that particular asset. There may have
- 24 been two that -- that I knew of.
- Q5 All right. So you....
- A There may have been four. I don't know.

- One off means a small number of people?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. All right. Okay. All right.
- 4 MR. COVELL: And we got that marked, right?

That's number G-5? 6?

- 6 MS. ZOBEL: B-6.
- 7 MR. COVELL: B-6, okay. All right. And.....
- MS. ZOBEL: You have it marked at G-6? I

believe it's B-6.

- 10 MR. COVELL: Yeah. Thank you.
- MS. ZOBEL: This is Mr. Boyle.
- MR. COVELL: Thank you. I've called him Mr.

Boyle consistently, too.

- MS. ZOBEL: Yes, you have.
- Ψ<sub>5</sub> (By Mr. Covell) As far as interpreting those sections
- 16 we talked about, are you aware of any written
- commemoration of an analysis of what that meant?
- $A_8$  Not that I'm aware of, no.
- Qo Okay. Would you expect that there is one?
- Ao I would have no idea.
- Q<sub>1</sub> Okay. All right. Thank you.
- 22 (Pause)
- Q3 And as far as this case goes, do you expect to testify
- as to whether or not Mr. Gilbert as a safety
- supervisor was exempt or non-exempt?
- A I'm -- I'm sorry?

# METRO COURT REPORTING

<b>Q</b>	As far as this case goes, Gilbert versus APC, do you
2	expect to testify at trial or give evidence otherwise
3	that Mr. Gilbert as a safety supervisor was exempt
4	from overtime?
B	If called, yes.
<u>ି</u>	Okay. And okay. And I take it your opinion will
7	be that as a safety supervisor, he was exempt from
8	overtime?
<b>₽</b>	My opinion, yes.
Φ0	Okay. All right. And what do you base that opinion
11	on?
<b>⊉</b> 2	The individual, number 1, as far as I know, what
13	little I know of the position, had direct
14	responsibilities for carrying out assigned tasks,
15	making sure the organization or department completed
16	assigned tasks, may have had supervisor
17	responsibilities for personnel, carrying out
18	management directives, policies, procedures.
₽9	Let me interrupt you. To until today, had you done
20	this analysis in preparation for this case? In other
21	words, prior to today, had you done an analysis of
22	that nature as to whether or not the safety supervisor
23	job was exempt or non-exempt?
<b>⊉</b> 4	Of that particular position?
<b>2</b> 5	Correct.

Α

No.

- Q Okay.
- A No.
- All right. Okay. And it would be correct to say that
- whether or not Mr. Gilbert filled in for Mr. Smith up
- 5 north in Mr. Smith's position, you have little or no
- 6 knowledge of that circumstance?
- A I don't.
- Q Okay. And since you haven't done that analysis yet,
- 9 you can't tell us what category of exemption -- is it
- fair to say, since you haven't done that analysis yet,
- you can't tell us what category of exemption the
- 12 safety supervisor would fall into?
- A3 No.
- Q4 Okay. Do you know how many hours the clerical staff
- at Kuparuk health and safety office worked on a
- 16 regular basis?
- A7 That particular staff? No.
- Qs Okay. Do you expect that it would have been 12 hours?
- Ag I can say the general work schedules on the Slope are
- anywhere from 10 hours to 11 and a half hours.
- $Q_1$  Okay.
- As Specific to that department, I don't know.
- **Q3** Okay.
- (Pause)
- Q5 It's been represented to me that the position of safety supervisor has been reclassified around April

- of 2003. Am I clear in understanding your testimony
- 2 today that you were not involved in that
- 3 reclassification?
- A No, I was not.
- Q Okay. I thought you were telling me it was not clear,
- so thank you. Again to be clear, and hopefully not
- 7 too redundant, you -- do you know anything about that
- or you don't know anything about that, if that was
- g done or not?
- An That's correct.
- $Q_1$  Okay. Okay. And again to be clear, and hopefully not
- redundant, do you know if material supervisors were
- ever paid for all hours they were suffered or
- 14 permitted to work?
- As I would have to go back and take a look at time
- sheets, individuals who occupied that job title.
- Q7 Okay. You have no information that.....
- A<sub>8</sub> I have....
- $Q_9$  .....they were?
- A0 No.
- Q1 Okay. APC has asserted a good faith defense in this
- 22 case. What -- are you aware of that?
- A3 Doesn't that -- that's a legal conclusion. I -- I'm
- not sure what.....
- Q5 Okay. Well.....
- A ....(indiscernible simultaneous speech) there.

<b>Q</b>	Well
2	MS. ZOBEL: You're asking if he knows whether
wge have	asserted an affirmative defense of having classified
i₁n good	faith?
5	MR. COVELL: Yes.
6	MS. ZOBEL: Okay.
办	Yes.
<b>@</b>	Okay.
<b>A</b>	Yes.
20	You're aware of that. Okay. What documentation is
11	will APC rely upon in asserting that defense, if you
12	know?
<b>⊉</b> 3	I have no idea. That's that would be something
14	referenced to counsel.
<b>Q</b> 5	Okay. Okay.
16	(Pause)
17	MR. COVELL: Off record.
18	(Off record)
19	(On record)
20	COURT REPORTER: We're back on record.
21	MR. COVELL: That's all I have, thank you.
22	MS. ZOBEL: And I have no questions.
23	(Off record)  * * * END OF PROCEEDINGS * * *
24	

25

SIGNATURE

# STATE OF ALASKA ss. THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT ) I, CHRISTOPHER B. BOYLE, have read the 4 foregoing deposition and have made corrections thereto. Any and all changes, explanations, deletions and/or additions to my testimony may be found on the correction sheet(s) enclosed with this transcript. 9 CHRISTOPHER B. BOYLE 10 STATE OF ALASKA )ss. THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT ) 12 THIS IS TO CERTIFY that on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of 13 \_\_\_\_\_ 2006, before me appeared CHRISTOPHER B. BQYLE, to me known and known to be the person named in and who executed the foregoing instrument, and acknowledge voluntarily \$\$\frac{1}{2}gning and sealing the same. 18 Notary Public in and for 19 State of Alaska, at Anchorage My Commission Expires:\_\_\_\_\_ 20 21 22 23 24 25

# METRO COURT REPORTING

# <u>CERTIFICATE</u>

UNITED	Sī	CATES	OF	AMERICA		)	
					)	)	SS.
STATE (	ΟF	ALASI	ζA			)	

I, Jerri Young, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter with Metro Court Reporting, do hereby certify:

THAT the annexed and foregoing Deposition of <a href="CHRISTOPHER B. BOYLE">CHRISTOPHER B. BOYLE</a> was taken before Cheri Tabor on the 1st day of June, 2006, commencing at the hour of 9:00 a.m., at the DeLisio Moran Geraghty & Zobel, P.C., 943 West Sixth Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska, pursuant to Notice to take said Deposition of said Witness on behalf of the plaintiff;

THAT the above-named Witness before examination, was duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth;

# METRO COURT REPORTING

THAT this Deposition, as heretofore annexed, is a true and correct transcription of the testimony of said Witness taken by Cheri Tabor and hereafter transcribed by Meredith Downing;

3 THAT the original of the Deposition transcript will be lodged in a sealed envelope with the attorney requesting #ranscription of same, as required by Civil Rule 30(f)(1) amended, that attorney being:

# MR. KENNETH L. COVELL, Attorney at Law, 712 Eighth Avenue, Fairbanks, Alaska 99701;

- 7 THAT I am not a relative, employee or attorney of any of the parties, nor am I financially interested in this action.
- 9 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 3rd day of July 2006.

11

Jerri Young
Notary Public in and for Alaska

My Commission Expires: 11-03-07

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

# METRO COURT REPORTING